

government in power and we are dealing with laws that have existed since 1877.

Why do we not have more in this bill? Why have we not dealt with more of what needs to be done to correct the deficiencies in the extradition process? This is not right. The member from Moncton referred to it as tinkering. That is being generous. It is stonewalling. It is being taken into the 20th century kicking and screaming, soon to be the 21st century.

This government seems to resist change. It seems to be following the course of history and the course of society. It seems to be reluctant to deal with what is happening in our society at the present time. It is always playing catch-up. It seems to be losing ground.

Sure, this is a good bill. This is a good provision, but this is obvious. This is motherhood. We cannot possibly not accept this because it is so needed, but it has been needed for a long time. It is because it is so obviously needed that we say to this government: "For heaven's sake, can't you see there are other provisions that are obviously needed in this bill?"

I do not accept the government's word that there is going to be a quick follow-up to that. I am sceptical I am afraid because I have heard the same undertaking with respect to the Young Offenders Act.

Last fall we had another one of these weeks where the government was putting through justice legislation. We were dealing with the Young Offenders Act. I talked to the minister. She did not come to committee, but I wrote to her and spoke to her. She assured me that there was going to be a second stage of changes to the Young Offenders Act. In a letter she assured me that she expected to have that second stage ready by December 1991. It is now April and we do not have those changes.

In this House we cannot just accept that. If it is wrong it should be corrected. It is not sufficient to say: "I will give you a piece now and I will give you another piece of the legislation later on".

The Department of Justice is a vast expanse of rooms and bodies. There is a lot of ability in that department. To see the small retarded flow of legislation necessary for our contemporary society is not sufficient. It is not meeting the demand. We have to be cognizant of that. We have to continue to tell the government not to give us this business about working on something else. As the member for Parry Sound—Muskoka said yesterday, it

Government Orders

was 1985 that he first wanted the changes to the Contraventions Act.

We need these changes. Society is moving very quickly. As I have said, I have hope that in this case, as it was in the case of the Young Offenders Act, the minister will come forward with this second stage quickly and that there is a sincere effort taking place in the Department of Justice to do this. We will not know of course until the changes are actually presented.

There are a couple of other concepts that are very important here in addition to the fact that we can return somebody to a country that will subject that person to capital punishment. There are two other areas, two other principles, that are very important.

The government has said, and I agree, that the right to unlimited appeals is not a right that this country can afford. What we want are reviews that are competent and comprehensive. I think this bill is going to look after that. The number of appeals is not the important thing. It is whether justice is done to the fugitive. That is the important thing. The fact that we have reduced the number of appeals is important. We have not reduced the comprehensive nature or the quality of the attention given to the rights and the demands of the fugitive.

• (1140)

The other point is that the Supreme Court recently said that the right to appeal is not a right which the charter protects. That is important to remember. It is something we have got to really keep in mind. We have got to keep that in mind so that we are mindful of the fact that while it is not a right that the charter protects, it does not deviate from the right of the individual to have his or her concern given quality attention. While there are appeals, we must make these appeals very important and we must give that the necessary attention.

This is why I objected yesterday to the government not agreeing to the motion put forward by the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam with respect to the fugitive being able to be whisked away after a hearing, but before the fugitive has had a chance to file for an appeal. It may be as the member for Peterborough said, and I tend to agree, that appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada may not be that frequent, but the right is there. If we have given the right, we have to give the means to abide by the right. We have to give the individual the right to make that application. Frankly, I am not sure that it is not there now, but I am not convinced that it is there. Evidently the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam is